UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,287	11/28/2005	Aki Vanhatalo	P4808US00	9403
	7590 03/08/201 ri & Steiner, P.C.		EXAMINER	
918 Prince Stree	et		CASCA, FRED A	
Alexandria, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/08/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@dcpatent.com

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/538,287	VANHATALO, AKI	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		FRED A. CASCA	2617	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	idress
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Designs of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this or D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 N</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowal closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)	Claim(s) 1-13 and 16-20 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawing Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-13 and 16-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/output on Papers	wn from consideration.		
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	ar		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CF	, ,
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureause the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage
2) Notic 3) Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

DETAILED ACTION

2

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on June 23, 2010. Claims 1-7, 8-13 and 16-20 are still pending in the present application. This Action is made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-7, 13 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Independent claims 1, 8, 16 and 17 have been amended to contain new matter. The phrase "a voice mailbox associated with the telephone number" added to independent claims 1, 8, 16 and 17 has not been described in the specification.

Further, the amended phrase, "the multimedia message includes an identifier to indicate that the multimedia message is created as a response to a failed attempt" as amended in claim 2 is not found in the specification. Further, the new claim 18 containing, the phrase "wherein the multimedia message is converted by a messaging server to a voice mail for delivery to the voice mail box" is not found in the specification. Further, the new claim 19 containing, the phrase

"wherein the multimedia message is converted by a messaging server to a voice mail for delivery

to the voice mail box" is not found in the specification. Further, the new claim 20 containing, the

phrase "wherein the multimedia message is forwarded to a web page associated with the

receiver" is not found in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelaez et

al (US 2003/0147373) in view of Hymel (US 2003/0216137 A1) and further in view of Castell et

al (US 7,283808).

Referring to claim 1, Pelaez discloses a method (abstract and figure 1) comprising:

determining to establish, at a device, a connection with a receiver using a telephone

number (Fig. 3 step 300, "a call is received from a user of a first device to a user of a second

device", note that a call is received, the user of the first device must have used a telephone

number to make the call, thus determining to establish a connection at the first device),

as a response to a failed attempt for establishing the connection (Par. 23, Fig. 3 step 302, "is the second device available", note that the unavailability of the second device is commonly associated with failed attempt for establishing the connection),

starting at the device, a multimedia messaging service (MMS) (figure 3 step 304-308, and paragraph 5, and Par. 23, particularly Par. 23, lines 9-14, "provide option to user of the first device to send a multimedia mail message," "send a multimedia mail message", note the user of the first device is provided an option to user multimedia mail message, thus the multimedia messaging service is stated at the device of the first user. Further note that in figure 3, steps 304-308 are equivalent to "starting a multimedia message service (MMS)", particularly as described in Par. 23, the step of providing the first user with an option to send a multimedia mail message is equivalent to the start of a multimedia messaging service)

and activating a recording function of a sound clip (figure 3 and paragraphs 5 and 12, "voice").

and transmitting the created multimedia message to the receiver (paragraph 5, lines 24-25, and Par. 26, lines 12-14, "user of the second device retrieves the message").

Pelaez does not specifically disclose determining to record a voice message to be included as part of a multimedia message in memory of the device.

Hymel discloses determining to record a voice message to be included as part of a multimedia message in memory of the device (paragraph 17-22 and figures 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Pelaez in the format claimed by applicant by incorporating the teachings of Hymel, for the purpose of providing convenience to users, saving time and using bandwidth efficiently, and thus providing an efficient messaging system.

Pelaez further discloses that the multimedia mail message is stored until the user of the second device retrieves, thus, there must be association between the location that the message is stored and the telephone number. the multimedia automatically (par. 5). However, Pelaez does not specifically disclose a "voice mail box associated with the telephone number," as claimed.

In an analogous art, Castell discloses voice mail box associated with the telephone number in order for call receiving devices to obtain messages stored for them (Col. 3, line 40-Col. 4, line 22, Col. 4, line 55-Col.5, line 9, and claims 6, 24 and 42, "voice mail box associated with a use of the wireless device").

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination in the format claimed by applicant for the purpose of providing convenience to users, saving time and using bandwidth efficiently, and thus providing an efficient messaging system.

Referring to claim 2, the combination of Pelaez/Hymel/Castell disclose the method of claim 1 and further disclose an identifier (inherent) in the multimedia message by which the message can be identified as claimed by applicant (Pelaez, Fig. 3, Par. 5 and 23-26).

6

Referring to claim 3, the combinations of Pelaez/Hymel/Castell disclose the method of

claim 1 and further disclose in addition to the sound clip, one or a combination of the following

is attached in the multimedia message: text, picture, and video image (Pelaez, paragraphs 12 and

14, "audio, voice, video," "text").

Referring to claim 4, the combinations of Pelaez/Hymel/Castell disclose the method of

claim 1, and further disclose the step of automatically transmitting the message containing the

sound clip to the receiver (Palaez, Fig. 3, and Natsumo, Fig. 8).

Referring to claim 6, the combinations of Pelaez/Hymel/Castell disclose the method of

claim 1, and inherently disclose the message transmitted is the number to which the original

request for connection is made (Palaez, Fig. 3, and Natsumo, Fig. 8. Also see the rejection of

claim 1).

6. Claims 5, 7 and 18-20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Pelaez et al (US 2003/0147373) in view of Hymel (US 2003/0216137 A1), further in view of

Castell (U5 7,283808) and further in view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

Referring to claim 5, the combinations of Pelaez/Hymel/Castell disclose the method of

claim 1.

The combination is silent on whether or not the step of transmitting to the receiver is as a

response to a confirming function as claimed.

The examiner takes official notice of the fact that transmitting as response to a confirming message is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Pelaez in the format claimed by applicant for the purpose of providing an efficient messaging system.

Referring to claim 18 the combinations of Pelaez/Hymel/Castell disclose the method of claim 1.

The combination is silent on whether or not the multimedia message is converted by a messaging server to a voice mail for delivery to the voice mail box.

The examiner takes official notice of the fact that multimedia message being converted by a messaging server to a voice mail for delivery to the voice mail box is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Pelaez in the format claimed by applicant for the purpose of providing an efficient messaging system.

Referring to claim 19, Pelaez disclose the method of claim 1.

The combination is silent on whether or not the multimedia message is being forwarded to a web page associated with the receiver.

The examiner takes official notice of the fact that the multimedia message being forwarded to a web page associated with the receiver is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Pelaez in the format claimed by applicant for the purpose of providing an efficient messaging system.

Referring to claim 20, the combinations of Pelaez/Hymel/Castell disclose the method of claim 1.

The combination is silent on whether or not the determination to transmit the multimedia message to the voice mail box is made after determining that the receiver is unable to receive the multimedia message.

The examiner takes official notice of the fact that the determination to transmit the multimedia message to the voice mail box is made after determining that the receiver is unable to receive the multimedia message is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Pelaez in the format claimed by applicant for the purpose of providing an efficient messaging system.

Referring to claims 8-13 and 16-17, claims 8-14 and 16-17 are rejected for the same arguments/reasons that were made in the rejection of claims 1-7 above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 8-13 and 16-20 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred A. Casca whose telephone number is (571) 272-7918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard, can be reached at (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Patrick N. Edouard/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617